IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of	)	
	)	
Sampath SRINIVAS et al.	)	Group Art Unit: 2155
	)	
Application No.: 09/706,296	)	Examiner: D. Lazaro
	)	
Filed: November 3, 2000	)	
	)	
For: DYNAMIC TOOLBAR FOR MARKUP LANGUAGE DOCUMENT	)	

TRANSMITTAL FOR APPEAL BRIEF

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is an Appeal Brief in support of the Notice of Appeal filed November 18, 2004.

Enclosed is a check for ☐ $250.00 ☒ $500.00 to cover the Government fee.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any other appropriate fees that may be required by this paper that are not accounted for above, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: _____
John E. Harrity
Reg. No. 43,367

11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800
CUSTOMER NUMBER: 44987
Date: January 14, 2005

PATENT
Docket No. 0023-0219

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Patent Application of	)	**Mail Stop: APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS**
Sampath SRINIVAS et al.	)	Group Art Unit: 2155
Application No.: 09/706,296	)	Examiner: D. Lazaro
Filed: November 3, 2000	)	
For: DYNAMIC TOOLBAR FOR MARKUP LANGUAGE DOCUMENT	)	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop **Appeal Brief Patents**
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

APPEAL BRIEF

This Appeal Brief is submitted in response to the final Office Action, dated August 18, 2004, and in support of the Notice of Appeal, filed November 18, 2004.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is Juniper Networks, Inc.

II. RELATED APPEALS, INTERFERENCES, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 17-20, and 22 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 19, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Guthrie (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,681) in view of Pacifici et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,230,171).

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Guthrie (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,681) in view of Pacifici et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,230,171), and further in view of Kanevsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947).

Claims 17, 18, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Guthrie (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,681) in view of Kanevsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947), and further in view of Chennapragada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,701,368).

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 17-20, and 22 are the subject of the present appeal. These claims are reproduced in the Claim Appendix of this Appeal Brief.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

An Amendment was filed on October 18, 2004 (subsequent to the final Office Action, dated August 18, 2004). A subsequent Advisory Action, dated November 15, 2004, indicated that, for the purposes of Appeal, the Amendment, filed October 18, 2004, would be entered.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

In the paragraphs that follow, each of the independent claims that is involved in this appeal and each dependent claim that is argued separately will be recited followed in parenthesis

by examples of where support can be found in the specification and drawings.

Claim 1 recites a method for inserting a toolbar into a webpage. The method includes receiving a webpage at a server to be delivered to a client (538, Fig. 5C; pg. 16, lines 22-28); inserting an executable script into each frame of the webpage operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser (558, Fig. 5D; pg. 17, lines 24-25, and pg. 31, lines 10-12), the toolbar including at least one link to a resource (pg. 30, lines 4-5); and delivering the webpage including the executable script to the client (564, Fig. 5D; pg. 18, lines 10-11).

Claim 7 recites determining a size of each frame in which the toolbar is to be displayed using the activation script inserted into each frame (906, Fig. 9A; pg. 31, lines 14-19); comparing the size of each frame to a threshold size (906, Fig. 9A; pg. 31, lines 14-19); and rendering the toolbar for each frame having a frame size greater than the threshold size (904, Fig. 9A; pg. 31, lines 19-22).

Claim 17 recites a computer readable medium including at least computer program code for determining whether a toolbar should be displayed in one or more frames of a webpage, said computer readable medium comprising: computer program code for determining whether an activation script for rendering a toolbar is within HTML code for each frame of a webpage having more than one frame (902, Fig. 9A; pg. 31, lines 5-7); computer program code for determining a size of each frame of the webpage using the HTML code (906, Fig. 9A; pg. 31, lines 14-19); and computer program code for rendering the toolbar in each of the frames of the webpage when the size of a frame exceeds a threshold size and not rendering the toolbar in each of the frames of the webpage when the size of a frame does not exceed the threshold size (904, Fig. 9A; pg. 31, lines 19-25).

Claim 19 recites a computer readable medium including at least computer program code for inserting a toolbar into a webpage at a server, said computer readable medium comprising: computer program code for receiving a webpage at a server to be delivered to a client (538, Fig. 5C; pg. 16, lines 22-28); computer program code for inserting an executable script into each frame of the webpage operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser (558, Fig. 5D; pg. 17, lines 24-25, and pg. 31, lines 10-12), the toolbar including at least one link to a resource (pg. 30, lines 4-5); and computer program code for delivering the webpage including the executable script to the client (564, Fig. 5D; pg. 18, lines 10-11).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Guthrie (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,681) in view of Pacifici et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,230,171).

B. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Guthrie (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,681) in view of Pacifici et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,230,171), and further in view of Kanevsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947).

C. Claims 17, 18, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Guthrie (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,681) in view of Kanevsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947), and further in view of Chennapragada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,701,368).

VII. ARGUMENT

A. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Guthrie (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,681) and Pacifici et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,230,171).

The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention always rests upon the Examiner. In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner must provide a factual basis to support the conclusion of obviousness. In re Warner, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 USPQ 173 (CCPA 1967). Based upon the objective evidence of record, the Examiner is required to make the factual inquiries mandated by Graham v. John Deere Co., 86 S.Ct. 684, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). The Examiner is also required to explain how and why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been realistically motivated to modify an applied reference and/or combine applied references to arrive at the claimed invention. Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp., 837 F.2d 1044, 5 USPQ2d 1434 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In establishing the requisite motivation, it has been consistently held that the requisite motivation to support the conclusion of obviousness is not an abstract concept, but must stem from the prior art as a whole to impel one having ordinary skill in the art to modify a reference or to combine references with a reasonable expectation of successfully achieving some particular realistic objective. See, for example, Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil, 227 USPQ 543 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Consistent legal precedent admonishes against the indiscriminate combination of prior art references. Carella v. Starlight Archery, 804 F.2d 135, 231 USPQ 644 (Fed. Cir. 1986); Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc., 776 F.2d 281, 227 USPQ 657 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

1. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 19, and 20.

With the above principles in mind, Appellants' claim 1 is directed to a method for inserting a toolbar into a webpage. The method includes receiving a webpage at a server to be delivered to a client; inserting an executable script into each frame of the webpage operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser, where the toolbar includes at least one link to a resource; and delivering the webpage including the executable script to the client. Guthrie and Pacifici et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, Guthrie and Pacifici et al. do not disclose or suggest inserting an executable script into each frame of the webpage operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser. The Examiner admits that Guthrie does not disclose the above feature and relies on col. 2, lines 59-67, and col. 5, lines 22-38, of Pacifici et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, pp. 5-6). Appellants respectfully disagree that Pacifici et al. discloses this feature.

At col. 2, lines 59-67, Pacifici et al. discloses:

> To resolve the above shortcomings of the existing Web collaboration systems, it is one object of the present invention to provide a platform-independent markup system capable of directly annotating HTML documents displayed inside the browser's window and operable across various platforms as well as vendor-specific Web browsers.
>
> It is another object of the present invention to have the annotations themselves be HTML components that are dynamically added to the document.

This section of Pacifici et al. discloses the ability to dynamically add HTML annotations to HTML documents. This section of Pacifici et al. does not disclose or suggest that the

annotations are toolbars or the rendering of a toolbar in each frame of a webpage, as required by claim 1. In fact, Pacifici et al. specifically discloses that the annotations are markups that participants of a web-based collaboration system make to documents (see, for example, col. 4, lines 10-20).

Moreover, even assuming, for the sake of argument, that one skilled in the art could reasonably construe Pacifici et al.'s annotations to be toolbars, this section of Pacifici et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting the annotations into each frame of a webpage that is operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser, where the toolbar includes at least one link to a resource.

At col. 5, lines 22-38, Pacifici et al. discloses:

> Since HTML documents can be composed of multiple frames or windows, a markup agent 412 is associated with each frame. The agent has several responsibilities within its frame including:
>
> if the user is the floor holder and is in one of the active markup modes, then all relevant mouse and keyboard input events are captured as shown at 416;
>
> the captured input events are translated into corresponding markup actions, i.e., composition of new dynamic HTML components, shown at 420;
>
> markup messages are composed as shown at 418, and passed to the client-side manager together with a unique identifier for the frame, in order to be transferred to other participants;
>
> on the receiving participant's side, the received messages are parsed as shown at 424 and the corresponding markup actions are performed shown at 420.

This section of Pacifici et al. in no way discloses or suggests inserting an executable script into each frame of the webpage operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser, where the toolbar includes at least one link to a resource, as required by claim 1.

Moreover, Pacifici et al. does not disclose that the dynamic HTML components are toolbars.

Further with respect to the above features, the Examiner alleges, in the Advisory Action, dated November 15, 2004, that "[t]he examiner admitted Guthrie does not explicitly disclose inserting script into each frame of a webpage. However, this does not exclude such functionality and the examiner believes the capability of of such a features is implied based on the fundamental concept disclosed by Guthrie" and points to col. 6, lines 41-56, of Guthrie for support (Advisory Action, Continuation Sheet). Appellants submit that this section of Guthrie in no way implies inserting an executable script into each frame of a webpage that is operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser, as required by claim 1.

At col. 6, lines 41-56, Guthrie discloses:

> The injected code 408, which is injected into the HTTP-response 409 by interceptor code module 402, contains instructions that specifically cause the WEB browser 401 to conditionally insert HTML tag statements (HTML code) into the document 407 when the browser executes the injected code. The HTML code is used by the WEB browser 401 to generate and display an instance of the injectable component. The conditions are determined by the injected code itself. In one embodiment, the injected code is written to only insert these HTML tag statements when the component is not already being displayed. Thus, the injected code, when executed, detects when the specified condition is met. Then, when the specified condition is met, through its normal processing of the HTML code in the HTML document 407, the WEB browser 401 creates an instance of the component that is specified by the inserted HTML code.

This section of Guthrie discloses that injected code 408 may cause a web browser 401 to conditionally insert HTML tag statements into a document. Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, this section in no way implies inserting an executable script into each frame of a webpage that is operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser, as required by claim 1.

The Examiner further relies, in the Advisory Action, dated November 15, 2004, on col. 4, lines 13-15, and col. 8, lines 15-18 and 38-40, of Pacifici et al. for allegedly disclosing "script insertion into each frame" (Advisory Action, Continuation Sheet). Regardless of the veracity of this allegation, Appellants submit that Pacifici et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting an executable script into each frame of a webpage that is operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser, as required by claim 1.

Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the above sections of Pacifici et al. could reasonably be construed to disclose the above feature of claim 1, Appellants submit that one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine this alleged teaching of Pacifici et al. with the disclosure of Guthrie, absent impermissible hindsight. With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges "[o]ne would have been motivated to have this as there is a need for a user to be able to incorporate add-on components in a webpage including webpages with multiple frames" and points to col. 3, lines 1-29, of Guthrie for support (final Office Action, pg. 6). Appellants respectfully disagree.

Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation with respect to motivation is merely conclusory. The Examiner has not explained why one skilled in the art would seek to modify the system of Guthrie to include Pacifici et al.'s alleged teaching of inserting an executable script into each frame of the webpage operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser. The Examiner's allegation that such a modification to the Guthrie system would allow "a user to be able to incorporate add-on components in a webpage including webpages with multiple frames" is unsupported by the Guthrie disclosure since Guthrie already discloses the ability to incorporate add-on components in a webpage (see col. 3, lines 22-25, and Fig. 3).

Therefore, it is unclear how the Examiner can allege that modifying the Guthrie system to include the alleged feature of Pacifici et al. would allow Guthrie to perform a function that Guthrie already performs.

Since the Examiner has not explained why one skilled in the art would have been motivated to modify the system of Guthrie to include Pacifici et al.'s alleged teaching of inserting an executable script into each frame of the webpage operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser, a *prima facie* basis for denying patentability has not been established.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Guthrie and Pacifici et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

B. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Guthrie (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,681), Pacifici et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,230,171), and Kanevsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947).

1. Claim 7.

Claim 7 depends indirectly from claim 1. The disclosure of Kanevsky does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of Guthrie and Pacifici et al. set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Appellants submit that claim 7 is patentable over Guthrie, Pacifici et al., and Kanevsky, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, claim 7 is patentable over Guthrie, Pacifici et al., and Kanevsky for reasons of its own.

Claim 7 recites determining a size of each frame in which the toolbar is to be displayed using the activation script inserted into each frame; comparing the size of each frame to a threshold size; and rendering the toolbar for each frame having a frame size greater than the threshold size. Guthrie, Pacifici et al., and Kanevsky do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, Guthrie, Pacifici et al., and Kanevsky do not disclose or suggest determining a size of each frame in which the toolbar is to be displayed using the activation script inserted into each frame. The Examiner admits that Guthrie and Pacifici et al. do not disclose this feature and relies on col. 2, lines 12-19, and col. 10, lines 45-62, of Kanevsky as allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, pp. 8-9). Appellants submit that these sections of Kanevsky do not disclose or suggest the above feature of claim 7.

At col. 2, lines 12-19, Kanevsky discloses:

> The unique display strategy of the invention is provided by a web page adaptation scheme that is implemented on a web site server, and also preferably partly incorporated on a client's computer such as in a web browser (e.g., as a java appelet). This adaptation strategy employs variables that provide size of screen and/or window information associated with the visual display from which a call to a web site was initiated.

This section of Kanevsky merely discloses an adaptation strategy relating to providing size of screen and/or window information. This section of Kanevsky in no way discloses or suggests determining a size of each frame in which the toolbar is to be displayed using the activation script inserted into each frame, as required by claim 7.

At col. 10, lines 45-62, Kanevsky discloses:

> It is to be appreciated that the example in FIG. 7 merely shows one simple example of the adaptation process of the invention and, as mentioned, among

> other things, web pages may also be expanded (objects and links added), if the user's supplied display size is greater than the display size needed for displaying web pages 201.
>
> Now, a detailed explanation of the automatic web page adaptation module 207 will be given. Referring now to FIG. 8, web page data (URL/CGI instructions received by module 207 through the search module 205 in FIG. 3) is represented as block 800. As explained, web page data consists of visual objects of different types, e.g., icons, text, graphic images. These objects have different sizes and locations when they are represented on a screen. For some of these visual objects, it can be estimated whether the objects fit a screen of a certain size directly from a script (e.g., URL) where the objects are described.

This section of Kanevsky discloses determining whether to render objects (described as icons, text, and graphic images) based on the size of the objects and the screen size. This section of Kanevsky in no way discloses or suggests determining a size of each frame in which a toolbar is to be displayed, as required by claim 7, or, as also required by claim 7, that the size of each frame is determined using the activation script inserted into each frame. In stark contrast, Kanevsky specifically discloses that a client machine 100 sends a display mode message that includes a display size to the server 104 when client machine 100 requests a web page (col. 6, lines 20-27). Kanevsky does not disclose or suggest determining a size of a screen, let alone a frame in which a toolbar is to be displayed, using an activation script inserted into each frame, as required by claim 7.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Guthrie, Pacifici et al., and Kanevsky is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

C. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Guthrie (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,681), Kanevsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947), and Chennapragada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,701,368).

1. Claims 17, 18, and 22.

Independent claim 17 is directed to a computer readable medium that includes at least computer program code for determining whether a toolbar should be displayed in one or more frames of a webpage. The computer readable medium includes computer program code for determining whether an activation script for rendering a toolbar is within HTML code for each frame of a webpage having more than one frame; computer program code for determining a size of each frame of the webpage using the HTML code; and computer program code for rendering the toolbar in each of the frames of the webpage when the size of a frame exceeds a threshold size and not rendering the toolbar in each of the frames of the webpage when the size of a frame does not exceed the threshold size. Guthrie, Kanevsky, and Chennapragada et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, Guthrie, Kanevsky, and Chennapragada et al. do not disclose computer program code for rendering the toolbar in each of the frames of the webpage when the size of a frame exceeds a threshold size and not rendering the toolbar in each of the frames of the webpage when the size of a frame does not exceed the threshold size. The Examiner relies on Guthrie for allegedly disclosing computer program code for rendering the toolbar in each of the frames of the webpage and points to col. 6, lines 41-56, for support (final Office Action, pg. 7). Appellants disagree.

At the outset, it is unclear as to how the Examiner can admit, on the one hand, that

Guthrie does not disclose rendering a toolbar in each frame of a webpage (see final Office Action, pg. 5) and then, on the other hand, allege that Guthrie discloses the very feature that the Examiner admits Guthrie does not disclose. Contrary to the Examiner's allegation with respect to claim 17, Appellants submit that Guthrie does not disclose or suggest rendering a toolbar in each frame of a webpage.

Guthrie specifically discloses a webpage including a number of frames 306-308 (Fig. 3). Guthrie specifically discloses that the system ensures that only one instance of injectable component 305, which the Examiner alleges corresponds to the recited toolbar, is generated and displayed in browser application window 303 (col. 5, lines 63-67), which includes, as illustrated in Fig. 3, three separate frames. This section of Guthrie clearly contradicts the Examiner's position that Guthrie's system renders a toolbar in each frame 306-308 of a webpage.

At col. 6, lines 41-56, Guthrie discloses:

> The injected code 408, which is injected into the HTTP-response 409 by interceptor code module 402, contains instructions that specifically cause the WEB browser 401 to conditionally insert HTML tag statements (HTML code) into the document 407 when the browser executes the injected code. The HTML code is used by the WEB browser 401 to generate and display an instance of the injectable component. The conditions are determined by the injected code itself. In one embodiment, the injected code is written to only insert these HTML tag statements when the component is not already being displayed.

This section of Guthrie discloses that HTML tag statements can be conditionally inserted into document 407 when the browser executes the injected code. This section of Guthrie in no way discloses or suggests rendering a toolbar in each frame of a webpage, as required by claim 17. The disclosures of Kanvesky and Chennapragada et al. do not remedy the above deficiency in the disclosure of Guthrie.

Further with respect to this feature, the Examiner alleges in the Advisory Action, dated November 15, 2004, that "the examiner interprets Col. 6 lines 41-56 [of Guthrie] as demonstrating the general concept being taught by Guthrie that allows conditional insertion of code into a web document. The code is operable to render a toolbar (injectable component) when executed by the client browser. Based on Guthries specification, a web document can include frames (Col. 3 lines 51-55). As such, Guthrie teaches a conditional rendering of the toolbar in a webpage, which could include each frame of the web page, based on specified condition described by the activation script" (Advisory Action, Continuation Sheet). Appellants disagree.

Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, Guthrie does not disclose or suggest rendering a toolbar in each frame of a webpage. The mere fact that Guthrie discloses rendering a toolbar in a webpage and that a webpage can include multiple frames would not reasonably lead one skilled in the art to conclude that Guthrie discloses rendering a toolbar in each frame of a webpage, as required by claim 17.

Moreover, as set forth above, Guthrie specifically discloses that the system ensures that only one instance of injectable component 305, which the Examiner alleges corresponds to the recited toolbar, is generated and displayed in browser application window 303 (col. 5, lines 63-67), which includes, as illustrated in Fig. 3, three separate frames. Therefore, Guthrie teaches away from rendering a toolbar in each frame of a webpage. The Examiner continues to ignore this argument.

The Examiner further noted with respect to claim 17 that it is unclear as to which "webpage" is being referenced in the feature "computer program code for determining a size of each frame of the webpage using the HTML code" (Advisory Action, Continuation Sheet).

Appellants submit that the webpage recited in this feature of claim 17 is referring to the webpage recited in the feature immediately above it (i.e., the feature "computer program code for determining whether an activation script for rendering a toolbar is within HTML code for each frame of a webpage having more than one claim").

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Guthrie, Pacifici et al., and Kanevsky is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing arguments, Appellants respectfully solicit the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-4, 6-10, 17-20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: _____
John E. Harrity
Registration No. 43,367

Date: January 14, 2005

11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

CLAIM APPENDIX

1. A method for inserting a toolbar into a webpage comprising:

receiving a webpage at a server to be delivered to a client;

inserting an executable script into each frame of the webpage operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser, the toolbar including at least one link to a resource; and

delivering the webpage including the executable script to the client.

2. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the at least one link is a graphical link.

3. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the executable script is an activation script.

4. A method as recited in claim 3, wherein the activation script determines whether the toolbar is rendered when the webpage is displayed at the client.

6. A method as recited in claim 3, wherein for each instance of the activation script, the activation script determines whether the toolbar is displayed in an associated frame of the webpage when the webpage is displayed by the client.

7. A method as recited in claim 3, further comprising:

determining a size of each frame in which the toolbar is to be displayed using the

activation script inserted into each frame;

comparing the size of each frame to a threshold size; and

rendering the toolbar for each frame having a frame size greater than the threshold size.

8. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the toolbar is a HTML toolbar, and wherein the executable script is provided in a script programming language.

9. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the resource is a remote third-party resource.

10. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the toolbar includes a plurality of links to different resources.

17. A computer readable medium including at least computer program code for determining whether a toolbar should be displayed in one or more frames of a webpage, said computer readable medium comprising:

computer program code for determining whether an activation script for rendering a toolbar is within HTML code for each frame of a webpage having more than one frame;

computer program code for determining a size of each frame of the webpage using the HTML code; and

computer program code for rendering the toolbar in each of the frames of the

webpage when the size of a frame exceeds a threshold size and not rendering the toolbar in each of the frames of the webpage when the size of a frame does not exceed the threshold size.

18. A computer readable medium as recited in claim 17, wherein the webpage and the toolbar are further provided on said computer readable medium.

19. A computer readable medium including at least computer program code for inserting a toolbar into a webpage at a server, said computer readable medium comprising:

computer program code for receiving a webpage at a server to be delivered to a client;

computer program code for inserting an executable script into each frame of the webpage operable to render a toolbar in each frame when executed by a client browser, the toolbar including at least one link to a resource; and

computer program code for delivering the webpage including the executable script to the client.

20. A computer readable medium as recited in claim 19, wherein the executable script determines whether the toolbar is displayed in each frame when the frame is displayed at the client.

22. A computer readable medium as recited in claim 17, wherein the threshold size of each frame is defined by the activation script within the webpage.